

Message

From: Young, Dianna [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=1F40B43CB3DA4607B17140C42CA12A12-YOUNG, DIANNA]
Sent: 12/6/2018 3:18:27 PM
To: Gervais, Gregory [Gervais.Gregory@epa.gov]; Burchette, John [Burchette.John@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: Example of recent Hunters Point communication from the public
Attachments: Manzanilla letter.11.20.2018.pdf; Hunters Point FOIAs_12032018.docx; Treasure Island FOIAs_12032018.docx; AX-19-000-1338--Letter.pdf

FYSA

-----Original Message-----

From: LEE, LILY
Sent: Thursday, December 06, 2018 8:27 AM
To: Azad, Ava <Azad.Ava@epa.gov>; Laija, Emerald <Laija.Emerald@epa.gov>; Young, Dianna <Young.Dianna@epa.gov>
Subject: Example of recent Hunters Point communication from the public

Dear Ava, Dianna, and Emy,

For your awareness, I am forwarding the following to illustrate the type of scrutiny that the Hunters Point site routinely receives.

1- A recent message exchange below and FOIA request below As context, the Navy distributed its draft Five Year Review for public comment and received comments from multiple non-profit activist groups. Mr. Castleman alone submitted 52 pages of detailed comments, with extensive legal and technical citations and quotes from EPA and Navy public documents.

2- Lists of FOIA pending requests for Hunters Pt. In addition, some members of the public have asked about potential links between concerns at this site with Treasure Island, so we have also received more inquiries there.

3- Letter to Administrator Wheeler from attorneys representing former police who worked at Hunters Point.

Please let me know if you would like any more information about any of these.

Thanks!

- Lily

-----Original Message-----

From: Steven Castleman <scastleman@ggu.edu>
Sent: Friday, November 30, 2018 2:44 PM
To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>
Cc: Manzanilla, Enrique <Manzanilla.Enrique@epa.gov>; Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>; Norman, Marvin D CIV WEST Counsel <marvin.norman@navy.mil>; janet.naito@dtsc.ca.gov; Brownell, Amy (DPH) <amy.brownell@sfdph.org>; Chu, Anthony@CDPH <anthony.chu@cdph.ca.gov>; bradley@greenaction.org; sheridan@greenaction.org; davidantonlaw@gmail.com; thomas.machiarella@navy.mil; Benson, Michele <Benson.Michele@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Letter re: Draft Final Parcel G Removal Site Evaluation Work Plan, HPNS

Thanks for the reply, but didn't EPA demand that the Navy include the PRG calculations in the Parcel G revision? What happened to that? The Navy will miss its November date for the FYR unless it happens later today, and their track record for time estimates has been consistently wrong. L

The Navy is already claiming the PRGs have been done and prove the current RGs are protective; and they claim their calculations would result in RGs that are orders of magnitude less protective than the current RGs. But they haven't released the calculations;] They have effectively prevented public comments on the PRGs.

We have a right to participate; all the Navy has had to do to deny us that right is refuse to do what EPA has been asking for since March. Is EPA going to be complicit in this or insist they provide the PRG calculations to the public and have at least a 30 day comment period? Your email is ambiguous in this point; will there be a public comment period of at least 30 days?

The PRGs must not be approved behind completely closed doors.

We know the most about the Tetra Tech fraud. The Navy has completely refused to investigate. If it had been left to the Navy, still-contaminated property would have probably been transferred. They have proven time and time again they have no interest in public participation. Every allegation we've brought has been backed up by solid evidence. Isn't it time EPA talk to us to discuss our legitimate concerns?

Will Enrique meet with us or not?

Steve
scastleman@ggu.edu

> On Nov 30, 2018, at 8:38 AM, LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV> wrote:
>
> Dear Steve,
>
> I apologize for the delay in responding. Many of us have been out of the office for the holidays.
>
> Thank you for your letter about using cleanup standards that are protective of public health, as demonstrated by using the current version of the EPA Preliminary Remediation Goal (PRG) Calculator. EPA continues to stand by its previous comments to the Navy.
>
> As an update, the Navy has confirmed that it is indeed evaluating the current radiological Remedial Goals as part of the current Five Year Review Process. This evaluation will appear in the next draft version of the Five Year Review, which will be made public for review by the public and regulatory agencies.
>
> Please let me know anything else you would like to discuss.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Lily
>
>
> From: Steven Castleman <scastleman@ggu.edu>
> Sent: Tuesday, November 20, 2018 4:25 PM
> To: Manzanilla, Enrique <Manzanilla.Enrique@epa.gov>
> Cc: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>; Fairbanks, Brianna
> <fairbanks.brianna@epa.gov>; Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO
> <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>; thomas.l.macchiarella@navy.mil; Norman,
> Marvin D CIV WEST Counsel <marvin.norman@navy.mil>;
> janet.naito@dtsc.ca.gov; Brownell, Amy (DPH) <amy.brownell@sfdph.org>;
> Chu, Anthony@CDPH <anthony.chu@cdph.ca.gov>; bradley@greenaction.org;
> sheridan@greenaction.org; davidantonlaw@gmail.com
> Subject: Letter re: Draft Final Parcel G Removal Site Evaluation Work
> Plan, HPNS
>
> Director Manzanilla,
>
> Attached please find a letter on behalf of Greenaction for Health and Environmental Justice concerning a glaring deficiency in the Navy's recently-released Draft Final Parcel G Removal Site Evaluation Work Plan; its continuing refusal to apply the EPA's Preliminary Remediation Goal (PRG) Calculators to the Parcel G plan.
>
> We intend to follow with additional comments on the Draft Final plan after we have had an opportunity to review it in more detail.
>
> We note that even though we have a years-long history of involvement in uncovering the nature and extent of the Tetra Tech fraud (and continue to investigate) and have commented extensively on both the Draft Parcel G Work Plan and the Navy's 5-Year Review, the Navy failed to notify us the Draft Final plan was released. So much for its commitment to community involvement.
>
> Please contact me so that we can arrange a meeting to discuss the Parcel G plan.
>
> Thank you.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Steve Castleman
> Visiting Associate Professor & Staff Attorney Environmental Law and
> Justice Clinic
> 415-442-6675 | scastleman@ggu.edu<mailto:scastleman@ggu.edu>
> [GGU Law Logo - Email]<law.ggu.edu>
>
> WARNING: This E-mail, and any attachments, are covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. §2510-2521. This email may contain confidential and legally privileged information. The contents of this e-mail, and any attachments, are intended solely for the use of the person or entity to whom the e-mail was addressed. This email may also contain information that may be protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, or other privileges, and may be restricted from disclosure by applicable Federal and State laws. If you are not the intended recipient of this email you are advised that any dissemination, distribution, or use of the contents of this message is strictly prohibited. If you received this e-mail message in error, please contact the sender by reply e-mail or phone. Please also permanently delete all copies of the original e-mail and any attachments.

